For The Northern District Of California

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

13

14

15

16

18

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Case No. 02-55795 JRG 11 || In re

3DFX INTERACTIVE, INC., Chapter 11

Debtor.

ORDER AWARDING CONTINGENT FEES AND EXPENSES BY SPECIAL LITIGATION COUNSEL FOR CHAPTER 11 TRUSTEE (COTCHETT, PITRE, SIMON & MCCARTHY)

17 I. INTRODUCTION

Cotchett, Pitre, Simon & McCarthy (Cotchett) is employed as special 19 counsel to William A. Brandt, Jr., Chapter 11 trustee. Cotchett's 20 employment was to pursue litigation against directors and officers of the 21 debtor. Cotchett requests that the court confirm its contingent fees in 22 | the amount of \$1,411,972.12, and expenses in the amount of \$69,388.00. The 23 court received one objection to Cotchett's application from Carlyle Fortran 24 |Trust (Carlyle). After reviewing the documents submitted by the parties 25 and considering the arguments presented at the hearing on Cotchett's 26 application, the court overrules Carlyle's objection. As herein stated, 27 the court approves Cotchett's application for fees and expenses.

28 II. BACKGROUND

ORDER AWARDING CONTINGENT FEES AND EXPENSES BY SPECIAL LITIGATION COUNSEL FOR CHAPTER 11 TRUSTEE (COTCHETT, PITRE, SIMON & McCARTHY) 1

8

9

10

11

14

19

27

Cotchett was hired by the Chapter 11 Trustee to pursue litigation $2 \parallel \text{against former directors and officers of the debtor (D&O litigation)}$. 3 Cotchett's application for employment pursuant to §§ 327 and 328 of the 4 Bankruptcy Code was approved by the court on August 28, 2003. The terms 5 |of Cotchett's employment provide for the payment of their fees and expenses $6 \mid \text{on a contingency basis under a fee agreement with the Chapter 11 Trustee.}$ 7 The fee agreement also provides:

Associate counsel may be employed at the discretion and expense of the attorneys, (with such approvals as may be required by the Bankruptcy Court), but these associate counsel fees shall not be an additional expense to the CLIENT and shall be deducted from the fees paid to the law firm.

Eventually the D&O litigation settled and the Chapter 11 Trustee 12 recovered \$5.5 million on behalf of the estate. Cotchett seeks approval of 13 the payment of its contingency fees and expenses.

Carlyle objects on the basis that the Chapter 11 Trustee's counsel, 15 Buchalter, Neimer, Fields & Younger (Buchalter), provided substantial 16 assistance to Cotchett in prosecuting the estate claim against the 17 directors and officers. As the Chapter 11 Trustee's counsel, Buchalter is 18 handling the Trustee's litigation against Nvidia.

The Trustee had filed an adversary proceeding against Nvidia for 20 claims involving fraudulent conveyance and successor liability in 21 connection with a transaction in which Nvidia bought the assets of the 22 | Debtor. In addition, Carlyle had initiated litigation against Nvidia over 23 the same transaction, which was removed to the bankruptcy court, with 24 pending claims involving breach of contract and various tort theories. The 25 |Trustee's lawsuit has involved substantial discovery, which Carlyle is 26 aware of considering Carlyle's litigation against Nvidia.

Carlyle asserts that approximately \$754,568.00 of Buchalter's fees 28 are related to analysis, coordination and assistance provided to Cotchett.

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT

For The Northern District Of California

6

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1 | Thus, according to Carlyle, Buchalter acted as Cotchett's "associate 2 counsel" pursuant to the terms of the fee agreement discussed above. 3 Carlyle requests that at least \$481,310.12 of the fees requested by Cotchett be used to pay the legal fees incurred by Buchalter in connection 5 with Buchalter's services as Cotchett's co-counsel.

According to Buchalter's fee application, filed under seal, a total $7 \mid \text{of } \$33,420.50 \text{ was spent with respect to the D&O litigation.}$ The $8 \parallel \text{application provides support for Buchalter's contention that it was$ involved for the most part with bankruptcy issues related to the D&O 10 litigation that arose from time to time.

11 III. DISCUSSION

The parties are in agreement that the standard of review of a 13 contingency fee is as follows:

> Under section 328, where the bankruptcy court has previously approved the terms for compensation of a professional, when the professional ultimately applies for payment, the court cannot alter those terms unless it finds the original terms "to have been improvident in light of developments not capable of being anticipated at the time of the fixing of such terms and conditions."

In re Reimers, 972 F.2d 1127, 1128 (9th Cir. 1992) (citations omitted).

In reviewing Carlyle's objection, the court concludes that Carlyle has failed to demonstrate that Buchalter's and Cotchett's coordination of discovery was a development that was not capable of being anticipated at the time Cotchett's application was approved. At the time Cotchett was employed, all parties, including Carlyle, were aware of the substantial discovery that was ongoing in the litigation between the Trustee and Nvidia and between Carlyle and Nvidia.

The fact that Buchalter provided assistance to Cotchett in the coordination of discovery was not an unanticipated development. It would be expected that Buchalter would provide Cotchett with relevant documents

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT

For The Northern District Of California

11

12

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

3

1 and depositions obtained as part of the Nvidia litigation to avoid a 2 duplication of effort and costs.

In addition, the court has reviewed the entries submitted by Carlyle $4 \parallel$ as evidencing Buchalter's involvement in the case to the point of becoming 5 \"associate counsel." The court disagrees with Carlyle's assessment. Many $6 \parallel$ of the entries reflect that Buchalter has been engaged in substantial 7 discovery with respect to the litigation with Nvidia. The court agrees 8 with Cotchett's statement in its reply that the entries "demonstrate that 9 both firms performed substantial work prosecuting their own separate 10 actions, though coordinating with each other given their common cli

For the reasons herein stated, the objection of Carlyle is overruled.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Cotchett's application for \$1,411,972.12 in

13 contingency fees and \$69,388.00 in expenses is approved.

14 DATED:

JAMES R. GRUBE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY JUDGE

3	
6	
7	
8	T 1
9	Judges hereby
10	OCC
11	Office are pla from w
12	by the
13	GOLTE
14	TRUS on the
15	designa
16	is topic
17	is true
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	/////
26	/////
27	/////
28	/////

Executed on

Case No. 02-55795 JRG

2

3

1

4

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT

FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE - page 1

I, the undersigned, a regularly appointed and qualified Judicial Assistant in the office of the Bankruptcy Judges of the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Northern District of California, San Jose, California hereby certify:

That I am familiar with the method by which items to be dispatched in official mail from the Clerk's Office of the United States Bankruptcy Court in San Jose, California processed on a daily basis: all such items are placed in a designated bin in the Clerk's office in a sealed envelope bearing the address of the addressee, from which they are collected at least daily, franked, and deposited in the United States Mail, postage pre-paid, by the staff of the Clerk's Office of the Court;

That, in the performance of my duties, on the date set forth below, I served the ORDER AWARDING CONTINGENT FEES AND EXPENSES BY SPECIAL LITIGATION COUNSEL FOR CHAPTER 11 TRUSTEE (COTCHETT, PITRE, SIMON & MCCARTHY) in the above case one ach party listed below on the next page by depositing a copy of that document in a sealed envelope, addressed as set forth, in the designated collection bin for franking, and mailing.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct.

LISA OLSEN

at San Jose, California.

CONTINUED NEXT PAGE

28

1 Case No. 02-55795 JRG 2 3 4 5 UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT 6 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 7 CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE - page 2 8 9 Nanette Dumas, Esq. William A. Brandt, Jr. Office of the U. S. Trustee Kyle Everett 280 So. First Street, Rm. 268 10 DEVELOPMENT SPECIALIST, INC. San Jose, CA 95113-3099 345 California Street, Suite 1150 11 San Francisco, CA 94104 For The Northern District Of California Stephen H. Pettigrew, Esq. 12 David M. Shannon, Esq. Jonathon S. O'Donnell **NVIDIA CORPORATION** L. Peter Rvan 2701 San Tomas Expressway, MS01 MBV LAW LLP 13 Santa Clara, CA 95050 855 Front Street 14 San Francisco, CA 94111 Stephen T. O'Neill, Esq. 15 LAW OFFICES OF MURRAY & MURRAY Robert Gebhard, Esq. SEDGWICK DETERT MORAN & ARNOLD 19330 Stevens Creek Blvd., # 100 One Embarcadero Center, 16th Floor 16 Cupertino, CA 95014-2526 San Francisco, CA 94111-3628 17 Robert E. Izmirian, Esq. Peter G. Bertrand, Esq. Robert P. Varian, Esq. BUCHALTER NEMER FIELDS et al. ORRICK HERINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP 18 333 Market St., 29th Floor The Orrick Building 19 San Francisco, CA 94105-2130 405 Howard Street San Francisco, CA 94105-2669 20 Betty M. Shumener Henry H. Oh, Esq. Steven D. Seiler, Esq. DLP PIPER RUDNICK GRAY CARY LLP 21 Douglas A. Applegate, Esq. SEILER EPSTEIN ZIEGLER & APPLEGATE 550 So. Hope Street, Suite 2300 153 Townsend Street, Suite 950 Los Angeles, CA 90071-2631 22 San Francisco, CA 94107 23 John L. Fitzgerald PINNACLE LAW GROUP Bruce L. Simon, Esq. 24 425 California Street, Suite 1800 Mark C. Molumphy, Esq. San Francisco, CA 94104 COTCHETT PITRE SIMON & McCARTHY 25 San Francisco Airport Office Center 840 Malcolm Road, Suite 200 26 Burlingame, CA 94010 27